

the audience at this display of unfairness. Judges and gendarmes quickly suppressed the noise, but Colonel Jouaust understood the rebuke, but he redoubled.

The most interesting part of to-day's proceedings was, as usual, at the conclusion. Major Lauth repeated in different words his testimony given before the Court of Cassation. He is not a prepossessing personage. He has cavernous eyes, with a monocle stuck in his right eye, a bulldog head, and was dressed in the uniform of an officer of dragoons. The audience did not follow his deposition with close attention, as everybody knew what he would say. The infantry sergeant who acts as messenger between Colonel Jouaust, Major Carrière and the witness, fell asleep in his chair in front of the stage, in full view of every one. He woke with a start when Major Lauth unexpectedly raised his voice.

Captain Junck, who followed, greatly amused the audience with an account of his alleged visit to the private room of Magistrate Bertulus, when, he said, he saw Mme. Pays partially undressed. M. Bertulus, who was sitting in court, jumped to his feet when the Captain began his story and shouted, in a way which startled the audience, "I ask to speak."

To this Colonel Jouaust replied: "You may do so later."

M. Bertulus, however, insisted upon being allowed to refute immediately statements of Captain Junck, but Colonel Jouaust, with an impatient wave of the hand, said, "Please sit down." Thereupon M. Bertulus resumed his seat, but the incident broke the monotony of the session, and people began to follow the proceedings with renewed interest.

THE PRISONER'S NEW ATTITUDE.

During Junck's deposition Dreyfus took frequent notes in his left cuff, and used them in replying to the Captain at the conclusion of the Captain's testimony.

The prisoner now seems to have quite recovered himself, and instead of making impassioned declarations of innocence he takes up the points of the testimony against him and discusses them clearly and with a force of argument which has a great effect on the audience, if not on the judges. He made a beautiful point against Junck to-day, saying, with reference to the latter's repetition of what Dreyfus said in private conversation concerning women, that the Captain also made him certain confidences. "But," added the prisoner, "if Captain Junck's ideas of honor allow him to divulge private conversation, mine do not. I have clean hands, and I will keep them clean."

The prisoner then replied in a forcible way to Captain Junck's statements against him in the questions of the manoeuvres and copying maps, etc.

The change of attitude upon the part of Dreyfus has given universal satisfaction to his friends. Hitherto he had confined himself when asked by the judge if he had any reply to make to witnesses to an impassioned protestation of his innocence. This made an immense impression on his hearers, but it only left a transitory impression. Moreover, General Roget made the significant remark in court last week that an innocent man does not merely protest his innocence, but defends himself. This undoubtedly stung Dreyfus into the line he adopted to-day when he rose and replied argumentatively and in a calm voice to the various points raised by the witnesses. The prisoner punctuated his remarks with moderate, well chosen gestures of his right hand, standing erect, facing his judges and holding his gold braided kepi in his left hand.

At the conclusion of Dreyfus's statements M. Bertulus ascended the platform and made a speech in reply to Captain Junck, accompanying his remarks with extraordinary gestures, dancing about the stage and waving his arms until the audience was convulsed with laughter. M. Bertulus, however, was quite serious, and opened by saying he rendered Captain Junck the honor of replying to him on the subject of the alleged Mlle. Pays incident. He then proceeded to traverse Captain Junck's evidence, calling him, in polite terms, a liar, and declaring that he took his wish for reality. The Magistrate scored several points against the captain, and General Goussé felt it necessary to go on the platform and speak in Junck's favor, in order to dispel the bad effect left on the judges.

Then occurred the Piquart incident. Colonel Piquart went upon the stage, confronted Captain Junck, and made a brief but very effective speech, pointing out that Junck had already made three contradictory statements while referring to the petit bleu, and adding that, in fact, he might be considered discredited as a witness.

THE DAY'S TESTIMONY.

Following is the testimony in detail:

General Fabre, ex-Chief of the Fourth Bureau of the General Staff, was the first witness to-day. He said that in his official capacity he compared the handwriting of the bordereau with the handwriting of various officers in his bureau, including the handwriting of a probationer who had been in the bureau the previous year, and who had not favorably impressed his comrades. This probationer, Dreyfus, who was regarded as untrustworthy and insincere in his pretensions, was, according to the witness, equally disliked by his comrades and superiors, and was constantly endeavoring by all sorts of means to learn the secrets of the plan of concentration of the Eastern Railway system. In his anxiety to secure information he neglected his duties. His official duties, the witness said, placed it in Dreyfus's power to disclose the documents referred to in the bordereau. The witness could emphatically deny all that Dreyfus had said on this subject. When Major Bertin showed the witness the bordereau the latter was struck with the resemblance of the cryptography. Dreyfus was the only officer who had made a bad impression on his bureau, and the opinions of the Chief of Staff and heads of other departments confirmed the witness's belief.

General Fabre, in conclusion, declared that he

There are times when a horse knows more than a man; when instinct is superior to reason. The horse fights against being forced over the brink of a precipice which he can see in the dark but which is veiled from the man's eyes. It is often the same with a man's body; it fights against carrying the man over the brink of the precipice, disarray. When the heart beats irregularly, when there are pains in the head, ringing in the ears, cough, indigestion, loss of appetite and lack of energy—these are the signs of a diseased body, or all of these symptoms—the body is on the brink of danger and is crying "halt!" No man need be carried over the fatal brink of disease if he will heed Nature's warning and accept her help. This help in the form of a "Golden Medical Discovery" is contained in Dr. Pierce's Golden Medical Discovery. This great alternative extract completely modifies every abnormal condition of the body, restores the disordered digestive or alimentary functions. It makes the stomach strong, the blood rich and the nerve centers and so regulates the functions of all the vital organs, that they co-operate perfectly for the health of the entire system. "Golden Medical Discovery" contains no alcohol, whiskey or other injurious ingredients.

Mr. Geo. Minter, of 217 Thompson Street, Philadelphia, Pa., writes: "Some time ago I was terribly run-down. Numerous ailments had been coming upon me one by one. I decided to try 'Golden Medical Discovery' and the 'Pleasant Pellets.' The benefit derived was beyond my fondest hopes. I took five bottles of the 'Discovery' and used the 'Pellets' when necessary. During the time of taking the five bottles as directed, I gained in weight 24 pounds, weighing more than ever in my life; bringing me back to health and strength, and removing the condition of indigestion, the heart, sleepless nights, pressing and splitting pains in the head, ringing in the ears, with partial deafness, and a nagging cough, indigestion, depression of spirits, loss of energy, constipation, a tired feeling upon rising and through the day, appetite gone, and all these ailments removed. I feel like a new man, and the 'Pellets' removed all those troubles, and more, and made me as well as fifty as I ever have been in my life."

If the bowels are irregular they can be regulated perfectly by Dr. Pierce's Pleasant Pellets.

was still as firmly convinced as in 1894 that the prisoner was the author of the bordereau.

After M. Demange had pointed out the discrepancies in Fabre's present statements and those he voiced in 1894, Colonel Jouaust invited Dreyfus to reply. The prisoner said that General Fabre correctly described the work on which he was engaged when a probationer, especially emphasizing that he had to keep the dossier relating to the concentration centres on the Eastern system posted up. The prisoner's reply was made in calm, measured tones, and his frankness seemed favorably to impress the judges.

A POINT AGAINST DREYFUS.

Colonel d'Abeville, ex-Deputy Chief of the Fourth Bureau, related how Fabre had showed him a photograph of an anonymous note, in which the writer intimated to his correspondent, "evidently foreign to army," that he had confidential documents to communicate. The witness told Fabre that the documents mentioned showed that the writer could only be an artillery officer belonging to the general staff, who participated in the expedition of the headquarters staff in June and July, 1894. The position of Dreyfus corresponded with these conditions, and, "to their great surprise," a striking resemblance was apparent in the writings of Dreyfus and the anonymous letter.

The witness further declared that only a probationer could possess the information mentioned in the bordereau. It was not only because of the resemblance of the handwriting that suspicions were directed to Dreyfus, but because he was in a position to be acquainted with the documents enumerated.

M. Demange wished to know why Colonel d'Abeville said in 1894 that he thought it necessary to investigate the officers who participated in the expedition of the general staff that year in order to discover the author of the bordereau. To this the witness replied that he was induced to do so by the expression of the bordereau, "I am going to the manoeuvres," for he considered the expedition of the general staff equivalent to the manoeuvres, although troops were not actually present.

Counsel, pointing out that a great deal of argument was founded on the expression "I am going to the manoeuvres," said that it should not be forgotten that in 1894 the expression was understood to apply to the expedition of the headquarters staff.

In reply to the usual question, Dreyfus remarked that he had never held any conversation with Colonel Sandherr, the late Chief of the Intelligence Department, who was so little acquainted with him that he once addressed him by another name.

THE DICTATION TEST DESCRIBED.

Greater interest in the proceedings was manifested when the name of the next witness was announced, an ex-Chief of the Detective Department, Cochefort, who was present when Dreyfus underwent the dictation test in Du Paty de Clam's office.

M. Cochefort declared that he knew absolutely nothing of the Dreyfus case when the Minister of War, General Mercier, summoned him to confer with him on the subject of the bordereau and the suspicions in regard to Dreyfus. General Mercier asked the witness's advice as to the procedure which ought to be followed, and introduced him to Du Paty de Clam. Subsequently, after M. Bertulus's report, the arrest of Dreyfus was decided upon.

Then the witness proceeded to describe the arrest and the famous scene of the dictation test, saying that from the first remark dropped by Du Paty de Clam the prisoner displayed evident uneasiness. Then, continued the ex-Chief of Detectives, Du Paty de Clam, placing his hand on the prisoner's shoulder, said: "Captain Dreyfus, in the name of the Minister of War, I arrest you."

At the time of the examination of Dreyfus, the witness said that he gained the impression that he might be guilty, and so reported when the Minister of War asked his opinion. During the formal examination Dreyfus protested his innocence violently and declared that he did not know what they wanted or of what he was accused. The witness afterward sealed up the papers which Du Paty de Clam seized at Dreyfus's residence.

Replying to a question of the Court, Cochefort said that since his first appearance on the scene he had had nothing to do with the Dreyfus affair, which was in the hands of the military authorities. He had not then seen the writing of the bordereau, otherwise his impression might have been modified. During the course of his reply the witness mentioned Esterhazy, but his remark was inaudible.

Colonel Jouaust invited Dreyfus to speak, and the prisoner replied: "No, I will reply when Du Paty de Clam is here."

TESTIMONY OF AN ARCHIVIST.

M. Gribelin, the principal archivist of the Headquarters Staff, was the next witness. He testified with great volubility, and expressed the opinion that when Dreyfus was arrested, in 1894, he was enacting a role by systematically denying all the charges against him, even the most obvious and least important things, and in declaring himself ignorant of matters which should have been known to every officer of the General Staff.

The witness said that he was cognizant of Dreyfus's relations with loose women. In support of this assertion he mentioned an alleged voluntary statement made by Mathieu Dreyfus, brother of the prisoner, in the witness's presence, that he had been obliged to pull his brother from the clutches of a woman of this description living near the Champs Elysées. M. Gribelin recapitulated the discovery of the leakage at military headquarters, the arrival of the bordereau, etc., and dwelt on the system of espionage conducted under cover of diplomatic immunity by agents "A," "B" and "C."

Colonel Jouaust—When was the bordereau received at the Intelligence Department?

M. Gribelin—The bordereau arrived at 1 in the morning, in September, 1894. After examining it we did not hesitate to attribute it to an officer of the Headquarters Staff.

Colonel Jouaust—When was it submitted to Colonel Sandherr?

M. Gribelin—Why, the very first day. As the bordereau arrived through the ordinary channels, or what, at any rate, were regarded as such, no doubt was entertained as to its authenticity.

Replying to further questions, M. Gribelin positively asserted that Esterhazy never came to the Intelligence Department.

In regard to the dictation test, the witness recalled Dreyfus's reply to Du Paty de Clam, when the latter pointed out that his hands were shaking, namely: "My fingers are cold."

A member of the court martial referred to M. Gribelin's statements concerning the use of Colonel Piquart made of the Secret Service funds, and the witness admitted the truth of Piquart's evidence that the surveillance of Esterhazy cost but little.

PIQUART'S ALLEGED INDISCRETIONS.

Questioned as to the alleged indiscretion of Colonel Piquart in showing Maitre Leblond the secret dossier, the witness admitted that when he saw M. Leblond in Piquart's office, in the autumn of 1896, while the secret dossier and the dossier of the carrier pigeon service were lying on Piquart's table, they had not been removed from their envelopes. The envelopes, he explained, were open, but he added, that was customary.

When questioned concerning the "libérateur" document, M. Gribelin admitted that he still wondered how it came into Esterhazy's hands, and could not understand why Esterhazy was

not arrested when he brought the document to the Ministry of War.

Colonel Jouaust, the other judges and M. Demange closely questioned M. Gribelin on various points, and in replying the witness imparted some information regarding the petit bleu and the circumstances under which the secret dossier was communicated to Piquart.

Replying to M. Demange, M. Gribelin admitted having mixed up Du Paty de Clam's and Henry's intrigues in favor of Esterhazy. This admission created a stir in the courtroom. It was by order of Colonel Henry, the witness added, that he (Gribelin) put on spectacles and went to the Rue de Douai to hand Esterhazy a letter, to which the latter was to reply "yes" or "no." It was also Henry who ordered written to accompany Du Paty de Clam to Mont Souris Park at the time Du Paty de Clam was quarantined under a false beard. The witness thought it would have been much simpler to have summoned Esterhazy to the Ministry of War, especially as it was known that Mathieu Dreyfus was about to denounce him publicly.

M. Demange remarked that the denunciation of Mathieu Dreyfus could not well have been foreseen when these "romantic interviews" with Esterhazy were occurring, considering that Mathieu himself had not then contemplated a denunciation.

M. Gribelin replied that at any rate it was known that measures were in progress against Esterhazy.

FALSE BEARDS AND BLUE SPECTACLES.

M. Demange—Why, then, since it was a question of saving him, were false beards and blue spectacles resorted to?

M. Gribelin—You had better ask Du Paty de Clam when he comes here. (Laughter.) Do not imagine it amused me. (Renewed laughter.)

Replying to further questions, M. Gribelin denied that he had ever opened a letter addressed to Piquart.

Counsel then wanted to know why the letter signed "Speranza" was not sent to Piquart, since all his letters were opened at the Ministry of War. M. Gribelin replied: "As I never opened a letter addressed to Colonel Piquart, I do not know why."

Colonel Piquart asked permission to question the witness. "When I left the Ministry of War," said Piquart, "I asked M. Gribelin to forward my letters to the addressees he knew. Since the letter signed 'Speranza' was not sent me, I must ask M. Gribelin if he did not receive instructions from his chiefs to intercept it?"

M. Gribelin—No, I never received such an order.

Piquart, after protesting against the manner in which his correspondence was tampered with, expressed surprise that the question of the employment of Secret Service money should be constantly mixed up with the Dreyfus case, with which, he added, it had nothing whatever to do. He also denied that he had given M. Leblond the slightest information regarding the secret dossier, and said the only document of the dossier revealed, and that was not by himself, was the "Cette canaille de D—" document, which had been utilized by the enemies of Dreyfus. There was also the "libérateur" document, which was delivered to Esterhazy, "who used it to levy the most shameful blackmail on the Government."

MAJOR LAUTH TESTIFIES.

Major Lauth followed. He traversed the ground covered by his evidence before the Criminal Division of the Court of Cassation in regard to the circumstances under which Lieutenant Colonel Henry communicated the bordereau. He said that when the bordereau reached the Intelligence Department Henry was absolutely the only officer who knew the agent who furnished it, and was the only officer known to the agent. Henry, he explained, had appointments with the foreign spy in question only in the evenings, at 8 or 9 o'clock at night, at various places, so it was impossible for Henry to hand the papers received to Colonel Sandherr the same evening. Therefore, he took them home, and brought them to the office in the morning. Very often these appointments were kept on Saturday, and Major Lauth believed that the packet containing the bordereau was handed to Henry on Saturday, September 22, and was taken to the office on September 24.

"One morning," said Lauth, "it may have been September 24 or another date, though it cannot matter much, I arrived at the office, and was about to enter the room in which I usually work, when Colonel Henry, who was walking in the corridor, called to me and took me into his room. Captain Mathon arrived simultaneously. We had hardly entered when Colonel Henry showed the packet received, and, exhibiting some pieces he had pasted together, said: 'It is frightful. Just see what I have found in this packet.' We walked to a window, and all three began to read the contents of a paper, which was none other than the bordereau. We discussed who could be the author."

"I must add that M. Gribelin entered the room, and was informed regarding the document. At the same time the bordereau was only shown to Colonel Sandherr half or three-quarters of an hour later, when he arrived."

Next, discussing the petit bleu, Major Lauth said that it reached Colonel Piquart, inclosed in a packet, early in March. Incidentally, the witness mentioned the mission to Nancy, on which Henry went, and said that while the latter was absent his wife came to the Intelligence Department to ask for his whereabouts, as she knew nothing of his departure. "It was the same with all officers of the department," said Lauth. "Our families never knew where we were going when we went on a mission, and it was through the department that they corresponded with us. That proves that things were not conducted in the Fourth Bureau as alleged by Colonel Piquart, and the officers were not so negligent and careless as he has asserted."

OFFICERS WERE RESERVED.

The witness maintained that this also disposed of Piquart's assertion that Henry was in the habit of working at home in the presence of servants. As a matter of fact, he added, the officers were very reserved before their families.

The witness proceeded to speak of Piquart's orders to destroy all evidence of the petit bleu having been torn, and to determine the office origin by affixing the postmark, etc.

"The spy Cuers," said Lauth, "entered into relations with the Ministry of War with the avowed purpose of revenging himself on his Government. He refused to accept payment, beyond his fare to Basle. Cuers was evidently an agent provocateur, who had been sent to us. But we were never able to get anything of the slightest value from him. It has been said," added Lauth, "that we bullied him to prevent his speaking. I wish the person who made the statement to come here and repeat it. The truth is we bullied him, not to prevent his speaking, but because he refused to say anything which was not known, and that means the same thing." (Laughter.)

Major Lauth's extremely long deposition was listened to in profound silence. He protested against Piquart's allegations against him in the course of the Tavernier inquiry, when he represented him as the instigator, and perhaps also the writer, of the Henry forgery.

"I declare," said Lauth, "that if, by inspiring or writing it, I had a share in any way whatever in the perpetration of the Henry forgery, I should have avowed it the day Henry committed suicide. I am not even now afraid of the razor, nor the broken glass of Lemerle-Pickard, nor even of a broken glass of Lemerle-Pickard."

After controverting further statements of Piquart, Major Lauth, in conclusion, declared that Henry, "who knew nobody on the newspapers," held quite aloof from the "press campaign or-

ganized in response to the action taken by the friends of Dreyfus."

After a short adjournment the court reassembled and the judges questioned Major Lauth. They asked his opinion of the Schneider letter of November 30, 1897. The witness replied that it was authentic and emanated from Agent "Pierre."

A MYTHICAL PHOTOGRAPH.

Replying to M. Demange, the witness said that he never saw the photograph which certain newspapers asserted that he took, representing Piquart and Schwartzkoppen strolling arm in arm at Carlsbad. "I suppose it was I who took it," the witness added ironically.

M. Demange said: "I do not accuse you." At the instance of M. Demange, Colonel Piquart again described the alterations of the petit bleu, and declared that the last time he saw it, the day before he started on his mission, the petit bleu was still in the same condition as when Major Lauth handed it to him in November, 1897. When Piquart saw it in the possession of General Pellieux, ex-Minister of War, it seemed to him (Piquart) that the handwriting had been somewhat modified, and at the Tavernier inquiry he noticed that alterations of quite a serious character had been made. Ruled lines had been erased. Moreover, experiments showed that the address had been written in ink made of gall nuts, while a superimposed word was written in ink made of logwood.

Replying to the president of the court, Major Lauth said that when he photographed the petit bleu he did not notice any sign of erasure. Colonel Piquart said that the plate taken by Major Lauth bore no traces of erasure. The photograph alone had been tampered with.

Colonel Jouaust—Was there an expert examination?

Colonel Piquart—Yes. It was a searching inquiry. Besides, the dossier in the Tavernier inquiry can be referred to.

Captain Junck followed. He said he was a probationer simultaneously with Dreyfus, but in another department of the War Office. He saw the prisoner a great deal, and gave details of conversations in which, he alleged, Dreyfus spoke of great sums he had lost in gambling and in intercourse with loose women.

"One day," the witness proceeded, "when we were visiting the Concours Hippique, we met three immoral women, who bowed to us. Dreyfus returned their greeting, and I said to him: 'Well, for a married man you have nice acquaintances.' He replied that they were old friends of his bachelorhood, and, pointing to one of them, said her name was Valtesse, and that she had a house on the Champs Elysée, where she gave nice parties, where pretty women were to be met, and where there was much gambling. Dreyfus also boasted of his large means, and spoke with great relish of his comfortable house and travels."

PLANS KNOWN TO THE PRISONER.

The witness, continuing, said that Dreyfus was well acquainted with the scheme for the concentration of troops, and could trace it on any map, as most of the other probationers could.

The witness then gave details about the work of the different bureaus, and proceeded to demonstrate that the probationers were cognizant of the plans for the transportation and concentration of the troops, and how Dreyfus was ordered to draw up a report on the German artillery, comparing it with the French artillery, and having access to all the necessary documents.

In regard to the Madagascar note, Junck claimed that Dreyfus told the witness that his cousin had procured him interesting information. Captain Junck then spoke of the efforts of Dreyfus to secure the firing manual, and discussed the theory that Henry might have divulged the documents in the bordereau. Such a supposition, the Captain declared, was utterly impossible. Later, the witness corroborated the statement that Colonel Piquart proposed postmarking the petit bleu, with the view of proving its genuineness.

MADE M. BERTULUS ANGRY.

The monotony of the session at this juncture was suddenly broken by M. Bertulus. Captain Junck was describing incidents with Mlle. Pays, said to have occurred in the magistrate's office one evening, when Esterhazy and his mistress, both in high spirits, discussed what they should drink, and, he added, Mlle. Pays removed her bodice. M. Bertulus rose suddenly, and in a loud voice asked permission to speak.

Colonel Jouaust—You will have an opportunity later.

M. Bertulus—I wish to speak at once. Colonel Jouaust—You will have an opportunity in your turn, sir. You will have it presently. Sit down.

Captain Junck then proceeded, and his account of what occurred called forth laughter from the audience.

M. Demange asked Captain Junck why he had not given the Court of Cassation information of the character which he adduced to-day as proof against Dreyfus, and why he had told the Court of Cassation he had seen nothing in the conduct of Dreyfus to lead to the belief that he was a traitor. This somewhat confused the Captain, who replied that he had not thought of it, but added that he adhered to to-day's statements about the character of the prisoner.

Dreyfus, after having said to say, replied: "I will not speak to the witness of private confidences he has made to me. If Captain Junck's ideas of honor allow him to divulge private conversations, mine do not. I have clean hands, and I will keep them clean. But there are a number of facts to which I will refer. I will speak first in regard to all the losses it is said that I sustained at the club at Mans. I declare that I was never a member of the Club Club at Mans, never visited it, and consequently never gambled there. I am convinced that the members of the club are very respectable, and ask you simply to have an inquiry made in order to know if I am speaking the truth. In regard to the lectures in the offices of the Headquarters Staff, at which, as asserted, I was present, they occurred in December, 1898. I was absent at that time, and consequently did not attend the lectures."

The prisoner then proceeded to show that in July, 1894, the probationers were informed by an official circular that they were to pass a period of probation in the army, the first year men in August and September, and the second year men in October, November and December; therefore, at a period when there were no manoeuvres.

DREYFUS DENIES CATEGORICALLY.

Regarding the officers' directing the despatching of troops at various points, Dreyfus dwelt upon the fact that he at that time was on a mission, and was not at the manoeuvres at all. "We must be precise," he added, "and not play upon words."

"In August, 1894," he continued, "the second year probationers knew definitely that they were to go to various regiments in October, November and December, and that consequently they would not attend the manoeuvres."

"I do not know," he continued, "what gossip the witness has retailed in regard to Siam and Madagascar. I did not understand it very well. It is certain that I should have greatly desired to participate in any expedition. It is the natural feeling of every officer. But I could never have had information through a cousin in the Foreign Office, for I had no cousin there."

Regarding the plans for provisioning and conveying troops, the prisoner said that he superintended the printing of them, turn about, with the other probationers. The entire work did not devolve upon him, and he only saw the small portion through the printing press.

When Dreyfus had finished speaking, Colonel Jouaust invited M. Bertulus to speak, and the

latter literally sprang up the steps to the platform, and, leaning sideways against the witness box, and speaking slowly and distinctly, he turned to the witness and said:

"Monsieur le Président: I will not do Captain Junck the honor to reply to the particulars with which he has regaled the Court regarding the visit to my office on July 26. I explained everything before the United Court of Cassation. I am here; therefore I have not been punished, and therefore my explanations satisfied the Judges of the Supreme Court."

M. Bertulus admitted that he left the office with the late Lieutenant Colonel Henry and Captain Junck, and accompanied them to the end of the gallery adjoining the office, because he was particularly interested in their investigation, "which," he added, "I may say had no result." The Magistrate greatly desired to know what special papers they were hunting for, but did not succeed in learning, in spite of all his efforts to extract the information.

ESTERHAZY, THE TRAITOR.

"Now," continued M. Bertulus, "one point is clear, and in regard thereto, I declare that Captain Junck's wish was the father to the thought, and he is wrong in saying that I told him I did not think Esterhazy was a traitor. My conviction on this point, gentlemen, has been unshaken since July 2, the day I arrested him, because at the bottom of my heart I was convinced I was in the presence of a traitor, of the sole traitor, and that in Esterhazy was the key to the trial from which France is perishing. That is why I arrested him, and this conviction, gentlemen, has become more profound in the case against Esterhazy. I never could have said he was not a traitor. I did not say so, because I think Esterhazy is a traitor, and I will maintain so to and against everybody."

General Goussé—I wish to say a word.

Colonel Jouaust—Please speak, General.

General Goussé—I should not have intervened if I had not heard Captain Junck's evidence contradicted. Captain Junck's account of his conversation with M. Bertulus and Colonel Henry in the corridor of the magistrate's office is perfectly correct, as reported to me. These gentlemen called on me, and repeated the conversation they had with M. Bertulus, and all Captain Junck told you he informed me of when leaving M. Bertulus. The latter said: "I know Esterhazy. Now, he is a flashy fellow, a nobody, a man of straw, but, so far as treachery is concerned, there is nothing in it."

Colonel Jouaust, addressing M. Bertulus, said: "Did you use those words?"

M. Bertulus replied: "I will not contradict General Goussé, who was not there. But I assert and maintain that Captain Junck's wish was father to the thought. I use the most polite form of expression."

It was thought the incident was closed, but Colonel Piquart jumped to his feet.

Colonel Jouaust—What! Again?

Colonel Piquart insisted, and, referring to the petit bleu in order to demonstrate how valueless was Captain Junck's testimony, he said that the court had only to compare the Captain's evidence with the results of the Ravary, Fabre and Tavernier inquiries to see the contradictions between him and Major Lauth. The court, he added, then would see the worthlessness of Captain Junck's statements. (Sensation.)

The court then adjourned.

SCHNEIDER STARTS FOR PARIS.

TO INSTITUTE PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE FORGERS OF THE DREYFUS CASE.

Paris, Aug. 21.—A dispatch from ENIS says that Colonel Schneider, the Austrian Military Attaché, whose alleged letter incriminating Dreyfus has been one of the principal weapons of the prosecution, has started for Paris with the intention of instituting proceedings for forgery and the employment of forged documents against those responsible for the authorship and use of the letter, which he has already distinctly repudiated.

EVIDENCE FOR DREYFUS IN ITALY.

Rome, Aug. 21.—A prominent Italian politician, according to the "Don Chisciotte della Mancia," has in his possession one of the most important documents referred to in the bordereau in the Dreyfus case, and the handwriting of the document is unquestionably not that of Captain Dreyfus.

GUERIN'S SUPPLIES ARE LOW.

INFANTRY REGIMENTS OCCUPY THE STREET BEFORE THE BESIEGED ANTI-SMITE'S FORT.

Paris, Aug. 21.—The Rue de Chabrol, in which is located the building in which M. Guérin and his companions are entrenched, is occupied by the 74th and 131st Infantry, with fixed bayonets. The investment of the besieged anti-Semites is being closely maintained, and the windows of the house have been closed. A doctor who visited a sick inmate of the headquarters, reports that the morals of the besieged party is excellent, but that they are worn out by the prolonged loss of sleep. A member of the Anti-Semite League says M. Guérin has three days' more provisions.

All the approaches are guarded and it is impossible to traverse the crowds, which are everywhere increasing.

M. Guérin's cook has been removed to the hospital. He complains that his illness is due to his privations, and says that M. Guérin has only twelve men with him, and that his provisions are nearly exhausted.